

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
CHARLOTTE DIVISION  
3:15-CR-00250-RJC

USA

v.

HECTOR MERAZ (2)

---

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

ORDER

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on the defendant's pro se letter asking for the return of seized property, (Doc. No. 83).

Now that he has been sentenced, the defendant seeks the return of an Apple laptop and an iPhone seized at the time of his arrest. (Doc. No. 83: Motion at 1). At the defendant's sentencing hearing and in response to a similar motion by a co-defendant, the government stated its intention to return the items when the convictions of all co-defendants are final, (Doc. No. 77: Response at 1), even though the defendant stipulated to their forfeiture in his plea agreement, (Doc. No. 46 at ¶ 9). One co-defendant remains pending for sentencing and the defendant's time to appeal has not run. Thus, the Court finds that the instant motion is premature.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that the defendant's motion, (Doc. No. 83), is **DENIED without prejudice** to be re-filed, if necessary, when the convictions of all co-defendants are final.

Signed: September 8, 2016



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.  
United States District Judge

